

JACK RUSSO (State Bar No. 96068)  
TIM C. HALE (State Bar No. 114905)  
JOHN KELLEY (State Bar No. 100714)  
RUSSO & HALE LLP  
401 Florence Street  
Palo Alto, CA 94301  
Telephone: (650) 327-9800  
Facsimile: (650) 327-3737  
Email: jrusso@computerlaw.com  
thale@computerlaw.com  
jkelley@computerlaw.com

Attorneys for defendants and counterclaimants  
ROMI MAYDER, SILICON TEST SYSTEMS, INC.,  
SILICON TEST SOLUTIONS LLC, and WESLEY  
MAYDER

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
IN AND FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

VERIGY US, INC., a Delaware Corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

ROMI MAYDER, an individual; WESLEY  
MAYDER, an individual; SILICON TEST  
SYSTEMS, INC., a California Corporation;  
and SILICON TEST SOLUTIONS, LLC, a  
California Limited Liability Corporation,  
inclusive,

Defendants.

AND RELATED CROSSCLAIMS.

Case No. 5:07-cv-04330-RMW (HRL)

**[PROPOSED] ORDER GRANTING  
DEFENDANTS' ADMINISTRATIVE  
MOTION FOR LEAVE TO FILE  
DOCUMENTS UNDER SEAL**

**Before: Judge Ronald Whyte  
Ctrm: 6**

Complaint Filed: August 22, 2007  
Trial Date: December 8, 2008 (jury trial)  
(Defendants have elected to reserve their jury  
trial rights under F.R.C.P., Rule 38)

1 Now before the Court is defendants Romi Mayder, Silicon Test Systems, Inc., Silicon Test  
2 Solutions LLC, and Wesley Mayder's (collectively, the "Defendants") Administrative Motion for  
3 Leave to File Documents Under Seal (the "Motion") as to certain documents identified as Exhibit  
4 3 to the Declaration of Jack Russo in Support of Defendants' Motion for Summary Adjudication  
5 and Motion to Modify Preliminary Injunction Order, and Exhibits B-F to the Supplemental  
6 Declaration of Romi Mayder in Support of Defendant's Motion for Summary Judgment and  
7 Motion for Rule 11 Sanctions.

8 Upon consideration of the Motion and the supporting Declaration of Tim C. Hale filed  
9 therewith, the Court finds as follows:

- 10 (a) The parties possess overriding confidentiality interest that overcomes the right of  
11 public access to the record in the above-named documents.
- 12 (b) The parties' overriding confidentiality interests support sealing the record;
- 13 (c) A substantial probability exists that the parties' overriding confidentiality interest  
14 will be prejudiced if the record is not sealed;
- 15 (d) The proposed sealing is narrowly tailored; and
- 16 (e) No less restrictive means exist to achieve this overriding interest.

17 Good cause appearing therefor, and satisfactory proof having been made, IT IS HEREBY  
18 ORDERED that Defendants' Motion is GRANTED:

19 IT IS SO ORDERED.

20 Dated: \_\_\_\_\_, 2008

\_\_\_\_\_  
Honorable Ronald M. Whyte  
Judge of the United States District Court